

## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. In response to the office action, applicants have amended the specification and claim 18. Claims 1-25 remain pending for reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1-10, 12, 13, and 15-25. Applicants note that the office includes an editorial error indicating only claims 1-23 pending in the application.

The specification was objected to because of an informality. Applicants have amended the specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because of an editorial issue. Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review and have amended claim 18 editorially to correct the issue. Applicants submit that amended claim 18 is now in proper form. There being no other rejection of claims 18 and 19, these claims are considered to include allowable subject matter.

Claims 11 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,817,396 (Perlo). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Each of claims 11 and 14 recite, among other things, a holographic film having adjacent structures formed therein to trap a significant portion of incident light therebetween. Claim 15 recites absorbing at least a portion of the incident light on the front side of the holographic film. Perlo fails to teach or suggest these claim recitations.

The office action asserts that Perlo describes a holographic film at col. 3, line 17. However, this is incorrect. Although Perlo mentions 'holographic techniques' at col. 3, line 17, in context the teaching of Perlo is that such holographic techniques would be too complicated and expensive for the antireflection surface described in Perlo (see col. 3, line 16). Perlo teaches that such techniques are even more difficult for 'large and complex shapes, such as those of motor-vehicle dashboards.' (see col. 3, lines 27-28).

The office action asserts that 'if a holographic technique is used then the film is holographic. However, Perlo expressly disclaims the use of holographic techniques at col. 3, lines 29-30, stating that 'All said drawbacks are solved with the surface forming

the subject of the present invention.' (Emphasis added). In proper context, reading the full paragraph at col, 3, lines 4-28, Perlo acknowledges the existence of holographic techniques but considers the complexity and cost to be a drawback, particularly for Perlo's application of motor-vehicle dashboards. Clearly, the complexity and cost of using holographic techniques is one of the 'drawbacks' that is purportedly solved by the surface forming technique described in Perlo. Using the Examiner's own reasoning, because the use of holographic techniques are expressly disclaimed by Perlo, the surface treatment described in Perlo is not a holographic film.

Because the antireflection surface described in Perlo does not teach or suggest the holographic film as recited in claims 11, 14, and 15, these claims are not anticipated by and are patentable over Perlo. Claims 16-17 depend from claim 15 and are likewise patentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. Early notification of the same is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

June 7, 2005

Date

/Paul E. Steiner/

Reg. No. 41,326

(703) 633 - 6830

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP

12400 Wilshire Blvd.

Seventh Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:  
**Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

On: June 7, 2005

Signature

Rachael Brown

Date